

Strong law of large number of a class of super-diffusions

Rong-Li Liu, Yan-Xia Ren* and Renming Song

Abstract

In this paper we prove that, under certain conditions, a strong law of large numbers holds for a class of super-diffusions X corresponding to the evolution equation $\partial_t u_t = Lu_t + \beta u_t - \psi(u_t)$ on a bounded domain D in $\mathbb{R}^d$, where L is the generator of the underlying diffusion and the branching mechanism $\psi(x, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\alpha(x)\lambda^2 + \int_0^\infty (e^{-\lambda r} - 1 + \lambda r)n(x, dr)$ satisfies $\sup_{x \in D} \int_0^\infty (r \wedge r^2)n(x, dr) < \infty$.

Keywords Super-diffusion, martingale, point process, principal eigenvalue, strong law of large numbers

2010 MR Subject Classification 60J68, 60G55, 60G57

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Recently many people (see [3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 20] and the references therein) have studied limit theorems for branching Markov processes or super-processes using the principal eigenvalue and ground state of the linear part of the characteristic equations. All the papers above, except [8], assumed that the branching mechanisms satisfy a second moment condition. In [8], a $(1 + \theta)$ -moment condition, $\theta > 0$, on the branching mechanism is assumed instead.

In [1], Asmussen and Hering established a Kesten-Stigum $L \log L$ type theorem for a class branching diffusion processes under a condition which is later called a positive regular property in [2]. In [16, 17] we established Kesten-Stigum $L \log L$ type theorems for super-diffusions and branching Hunt processes respectively.

This paper is a natural continuation of [16, 17]. The main purpose of this paper is to establish a strong law of large numbers for a class of super-diffusions. The main tool of this paper is the stochastic integral representation of super-diffusions.

Throughout this paper, we will use the following notations. For any positive integer k , $C_b^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the family of bounded functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ whose partial derivatives of order up to k are bounded and continuous, $C_0^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the family of functions of compact support on $\mathbb{R}^d$ whose

*The research of this author is supported by NSFC (Grant No. 10871103 and 10971003) and Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education.

partial derivatives of order up to k are continuous. For any open set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the meanings of $C_b^k(D)$ and $C_0^k(D)$ are similar. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_F(D)$ the space of finite measures on D equipped with the topology of weak convergence. We will use $\mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$ to denote the subspace of nontrivial measures in $\mathcal{M}_F(D)$. The integral of a function φ with respect to a measure μ will often be denoted as $\langle \varphi, \mu \rangle$.

For convenience we use the following convention throughout this paper: For any probability measure P , we also use P to denote the expectation with respect to P .

1.2 Model

Suppose that $a_{ij} \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $i, j = 1, \dots, d$, and that the matrix (a_{ij}) is symmetric and satisfies

$$0 < a|v|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} v_i v_j, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } v \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

for some positive constant a . We assume that $b_i, i = 1, \dots, d$, are bounded Borel functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$. We will use $(\xi, \Pi_x, x \in \mathbb{R}^d)$ to denote a diffusion process on $\mathbb{R}^d$ corresponding to the operator

$$L = \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot a \nabla + b \cdot \nabla.$$

In this paper we will always assume that D is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We will use $(\xi^D, \Pi_x, x \in D)$ to denote the process obtained by killing ξ upon exiting from D , that is,

$$\xi_t^D = \begin{cases} \xi_t & \text{if } t < \tau, \\ \partial, & \text{if } t \geq \tau, \end{cases}$$

where $\tau = \inf\{t > 0; \xi_t \notin D\}$ is the first exit time of D and ∂ is a cemetery point. Any function f on D is automatically extended to $D \cup \{\partial\}$ by setting $f(\partial) = 0$.

We will always assume that β is a bounded Borel function on $\mathbb{R}^d$. We will use $\{P_t^D\}_{t \geq 0}$ to denote the following Feynman-Kac semigroup

$$P_t^D f(x) = \Pi_x \left(\exp \left(\int_0^t \beta(\xi_s^D) ds \right) f(\xi_t^D) \right), \quad x \in D.$$

It is well known that the semigroup $\{P_t^D\}_{t \geq 0}$ is strongly continuous in $L^2(D)$ and, for any $t > 0$, P_t^D has a bounded, continuous and strictly positive density $p^D(t, x, y)$.

Let $\{\hat{P}_t^D\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the dual semigroup of $\{P_t^D\}_{t \geq 0}$ defined by

$$\hat{P}_t^D f(x) = \int_D p^D(t, y, x) f(y) dy, \quad x \in D.$$

It is well known that $\{\hat{P}_t^D\}_{t \geq 0}$ is also strongly continuous in $L^2(D)$.

Let $\mathbf{A}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ be the generators of the semigroups $\{P_t^D\}_{t \geq 0}$ and $\{\hat{P}_t^D\}_{t \geq 0}$ in $L^2(D)$ respectively. Let $\sigma(\mathbf{A})$ ($\sigma(\hat{\mathbf{A}})$ resp.) denote the spectrum of $\mathbf{A}$ ($\hat{\mathbf{A}}$, resp.). It follows from Jentzsch's theorem ([19, Theorem V.6.6, p. 337]) and the strong continuity of $\{P_t^D\}_{t \geq 0}$ and $\{\hat{P}_t^D\}_{t \geq 0}$ that the common

value $\lambda_1 := \sup \operatorname{Re}(\sigma(\mathbf{A})) = \sup \operatorname{Re}(\sigma(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}))$ is an eigenvalue of multiplicity 1 for both $\mathbf{A}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$, and that an eigenfunction ϕ of $\mathbf{A}$ associated with λ_1 can be chosen to be strictly positive a.e. on D and an eigenfunction $\tilde{\phi}$ of $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$ associated with λ_1 can be chosen to be strictly positive a.e. on D . By [13, Proposition 2.3] we know that ϕ and $\tilde{\phi}$ are bounded and continuous on D , and they are in fact strictly positive everywhere on D . We choose ϕ and $\tilde{\phi}$ so that $\int_D \phi(x)\tilde{\phi}(x)dx = 1$.

Throughout this paper we assume the following

Assumption 1 *The semigroups $\{P_t^D\}_{t \geq 0}$ and $\{\widehat{P}_t^D\}_{t \geq 0}$ are intrinsically ultracontractive, that is, for any $t > 0$, there exists a constant $c_t > 0$ such that*

$$p^D(t, x, y) \leq c_t \phi(x) \tilde{\phi}(y), \quad \text{for all } (x, y) \in D \times D.$$

Assumption 1 is a very weak regularity assumption on D . It follows from [13, 14] that Assumption 1 is satisfied when D is a bounded Lipschitz domain. For other, more general, examples of domain D for which Assumption 1 is satisfied, we refer our readers to [14] and the references therein.

Define

$$p^\phi(t, x, y) = \frac{e^{-\lambda_1 t}}{\phi(x)} p^D(t, x, y) \phi(y). \quad (1.1)$$

Then it follows from [13, Theorem 2.7] that if Assumption 1 holds, then for any $\sigma > 0$ there are positive constants $C(\sigma)$ and ν such that

$$\left| p^\phi(t, x, y) - \phi(y) \tilde{\phi}(y) \right| = \left| \frac{e^{-\lambda_1 t} p^D(t, x, y) \phi(y)}{\phi(x)} - \phi(y) \tilde{\phi}(y) \right| \leq C(\sigma) e^{-\nu t} \phi(y) \tilde{\phi}(y), \quad x, y \in D, t > \sigma. \quad (1.2)$$

By the definition of ϕ and $\tilde{\phi}$, it is easy to check that, for any $t > 0$, $p^\phi(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ is a probability density and that $\phi \tilde{\phi}$ is its unique invariant probability density. (1.2) shows that $p^\phi(t, \cdot, x)$ converges to $\phi(x) \tilde{\phi}(x)$ uniformly with exponential rate. Denote by P_t^ϕ the semigroup with density $p^\phi(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ and Π_h^ϕ the probability generated by $(P_t^\phi)_{t \geq 0}$ with initial distribution $h(x)dx$ on D . Then $(\xi^D, \Pi_{\phi \tilde{\phi}}^\phi)$ is a diffusion with initial distribution $\phi(x) \tilde{\phi}(x)dx$.

The super-diffusion $(X, \mathbb{P}_\mu)$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$, we are going to study is a $(\xi^D, \psi(\lambda) - \beta\lambda)$ -superprocess, which is a measure-valued Markov process with underlying spatial motion ξ^D , branching rate dt and branching mechanism $\psi(\lambda) - \beta\lambda$, where

$$\psi(x, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \alpha(x) \lambda^2 + \int_0^\infty (e^{-r\lambda} - 1 + \lambda r) n(x, dr), \quad \lambda > 0,$$

for some nonnegative bounded measurable function α on D and for some σ -finite kernel n from $(D, \mathcal{B}(D))$ to $(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+))$, that is, $n(x, dr)$ is a σ -finite measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$ for each fixed x , and $n(\cdot, B)$ is a measurable function for each Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{R}_+$. The measure μ here is the initial value of X . In this paper we will always assume that

$$\sup_{x \in D} \int_0^\infty (r \wedge r^2) n(x, dr) < \infty. \quad (1.3)$$

Note that this assumption implies, for any fixed $\lambda > 0$, $\psi(\cdot, \lambda)$ is bounded on D . Define a new kernel $n^\phi(x, dr)$ from $(D, \mathcal{B}(D))$ to $(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+))$ such that for any nonnegative measurable function f on $\mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\int_0^\infty f(r) n^\phi(x, dr) = \int_0^\infty f(r\phi(x)) n(x, dr), \quad x \in D. \quad (1.4)$$

Then, by (1.3) and the boundedness of ϕ , n^ϕ satisfies

$$\sup_{x \in D} \int_0^\infty (r \wedge r^2) n^\phi(x, dr) < \infty. \quad (1.5)$$

1.3 Stochastic Integral Representation and Main Result

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}_\mu, \mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0)$ be the underlying probability space equipped with the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)$, which is generated by X and is completed as usual with the $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ -measurable and $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ -negligible sets for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$. It is known (cf. [5, Section 6.1]) that the super-diffusion X is a solution to the following martingale problem: for any $\varphi \in C_0^2(D)$ and $h \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\begin{aligned} & h(\langle \varphi, X_t \rangle) - h(\langle \varphi, \mu \rangle) - \int_0^t h'(\langle \varphi, X_s \rangle) \langle \mathbf{A}\varphi, X_s \rangle ds - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t h''(\langle \varphi, X_s \rangle) \langle \alpha \varphi^2, X_s \rangle ds \\ & - \int_0^t \int_D \int_{(0, \infty)} (h(\langle \varphi, X_s \rangle + r\varphi(x)) - h(\langle \varphi, X_s \rangle) - h'(\langle \varphi, X_s \rangle) r\varphi(x)) n(x, dr) X_s(dx) ds \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

is a martingale. Let J denote the set of all jump times of X and δ denote the Dirac measure. It is easy to see from the martingale problem (1.6) that the only possible jumps of X are point measures $r\delta_x(\cdot)$ with r being a positive real number and $x \in D$. (1.6) implies that the compensator of the random measure

$$N := \sum_{s \in J} \delta_{(s, \Delta X_s)}$$

is a random measure $\widehat{N}$ on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$ such that for any nonnegative predictable function F on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \times \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$,

$$\int \int F(s, \omega, \nu) \widehat{N}(ds, d\nu) = \int_0^\infty ds \int_D X_s(dx) \int_0^\infty F(s, \omega, r\delta_x) n(x, dr), \quad (1.7)$$

where $n(x, dr)$ is the kernel of the branching mechanism ψ . Therefore we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\sum_{s \in J} F(s, \omega, \Delta X_s) \right] = \mathbb{P}_\mu \int_0^\infty ds \int_D X_s(dx) \int_0^\infty F(s, \omega, r\delta_x) n(x, dr). \quad (1.8)$$

See [5, p. 111]. Let F be a predictable function on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \times \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$ satisfying

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\left(\sum_{s \in [0, t], s \in J} F(s, \Delta X_s)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right] < \infty, \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0.$$

Then the stochastic integral of F with respect to the compensated random measure $N - \widehat{N}$

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{M}_F(D)^0} F(s, \nu)(N - \widehat{N})(ds, d\nu),$$

can be defined (cf. [15] and the reference therein) as the unique purely discontinuous martingale (vanishing at time 0) whose jumps are indistinguishable from $1_J(s)F(s, \Delta X_s)$.

Suppose that φ is a measurable function on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times D$. Define

$$F_\varphi(s, \nu) := \int_D \varphi(s, x) \nu(dx), \quad \nu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D) \quad (1.9)$$

whenever the integral above makes sense. We write

$$S_t^J(\varphi) = \int_0^t \int_D \varphi(s, x) S^J(ds, dx) := \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{M}_F(D)^0} F_\varphi(s, \nu)(N - \widehat{N})(ds, d\nu), \quad (1.10)$$

whenever the right hand of (1.10) makes sense. If φ is bounded on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times D$, then $S_t^J(\varphi)$ is well defined. Indeed, we only need to check that

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\left(\sum_{s \in [0, t], s \in J} F_\varphi(s, \Delta X_s)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right] < \infty, \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0. \quad (1.11)$$

Note that, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\left(\sum_{s \in [0, t], s \in J} F_\varphi(s, \Delta X_s)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\left(\sum_{s \in [0, t], s \in J} \left(\int \varphi(s, x) (\Delta X_s)(dx) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &\leq \|\varphi\|_\infty \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\left(\sum_{s \in [0, t], s \in J} \langle 1, \Delta X_s \rangle^2 I_{\{\langle 1, \Delta X_s \rangle \leq 1\}} + \sum_{s \in [0, t], s \in J} \langle 1, \Delta X_s \rangle^2 I_{\{\langle 1, \Delta X_s \rangle > 1\}} \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &\leq \|\varphi\|_\infty \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\left(\sum_{s \in [0, t], s \in J} \langle 1, \Delta X_s \rangle^2 I_{\{\langle 1, \Delta X_s \rangle \leq 1\}} \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &\quad + \|\varphi\|_\infty \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\left(\sum_{s \in [0, t], s \in J} \langle 1, \Delta X_s \rangle^2 I_{\{\langle 1, \Delta X_s \rangle > 1\}} \right)^{1/2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here and throughout this paper, for any set A , I_A stands for the indicator function of A . Using the first two displays on [15, p. 203], we get (1.11). Thus for any bounded function φ on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times D$, $(S_t^J(\varphi))_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale.

For any $\varphi \in C_0^2(D)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)$,

$$\langle \varphi, X_t \rangle = \langle \varphi, \mu \rangle + S_t^J(\varphi) + S_t^C(\varphi) + \int_0^t \langle \mathbf{A}\varphi, X_s \rangle ds, \quad (1.12)$$

where $S_t^C(\varphi)$ is a continuous local martingale with quadratic variation

$$\langle S^C(\varphi) \rangle_t = \int_0^t \langle \alpha \varphi^2, X_s \rangle ds. \quad (1.13)$$

In fact, according to [10, 11], the above is still valid when $\mathbf{A}$ is replaced by $\mathbf{L} + \beta$, where $\mathbf{L}$ is the weak generator of ξ^D in the sense of [10, Section 4]. Using this, [11, Corollary 2.18] and applying a limit argument, one can show that for any bounded function g on D ,

$$\langle g, X_t \rangle = \langle P_t^D g, \mu \rangle + \int_0^t \int_D P_{t-s}^D g(x) S^J(ds, dx) + \int_0^t \int_D P_{t-s}^D g(x) S^C(ds, dx). \quad (1.14)$$

In particular, taking $g = \phi$ in (1.14), where ϕ is the positive eigenfunction of $\mathbf{A}$ defined in Section 1.1, we get that

$$e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi, X_t \rangle = \langle \phi, \mu \rangle + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int_D \phi(x) S^J(ds, dx) + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int_D \phi(x) S^C(ds, dx). \quad (1.15)$$

Set $M_t(\phi) := e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi, X_t \rangle$. Then $M_t(\phi), t \geq 0$, is a nonnegative martingale. Denote by $M_\infty(\phi)$ the almost sure limit of $M_t(\phi)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. In [16], we studied the relationship between the degeneracy property of $M_\infty(\phi)$ and the function l :

$$l(y) := \int_1^\infty r \ln r n^\phi(y, dr). \quad (1.16)$$

Theorem 1.1 [16, Theorem 1.1] *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, $\lambda_1 > 0$ and that X is a $(\xi^D, \psi(\lambda) - \beta\lambda)$ -super-diffusion. Then the following assertions hold:*

- (1) *If $\int_D l(y) \tilde{\phi}(y) dy < \infty$, then $M_\infty(\phi)$ is non-degenerate under $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$, and $M_\infty(\phi)$ is also the $L^1(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$ limit of $M_t(\phi)$.*
- (2) *If $\int_D l(y) \tilde{\phi}(y) dy = \infty$, then $M_\infty(\phi) = 0$, $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ -a.s. for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$.*

Remark 1.2 *In [16, Theorem 1.1], we only stated that in case (1) under the extra assumption $\alpha \equiv 0$, $M_\infty(\phi)$ is non-degenerate under $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$. But actually in this case we have $\mathbb{P}_\mu M_\infty(\phi) = \mathbb{P}_\mu M_0(\phi)$ (see [16, Lemma 3.4]), and therefore $M_t(\phi)$ converges to $M_\infty(\phi)$ in $L^1(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$.*

For general $\alpha \geq 0$, by the L^2 maximum inequality, and using the fact that α and ϕ are bounded in D , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\sup_{t \geq 0} \left(\int_0^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int_D \phi(x) S^C(ds, dx) \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq 4 \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\int_0^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int_D \phi(x) S^C(ds, dx) \right)^2 \\ & = 4 \mathbb{P}_\mu \int_0^\infty e^{-2\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \alpha(x) \phi^2(x) X_s(dx) \\ & = 4 \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \phi(y) \mu(dy) \int_D p^\phi(s, y, x) \alpha(x) \phi(x) dx \\ & < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (1.17)$$

Thus the martingale $\left(\int_0^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int_D \phi(x) S^C(ds, dx)\right)_{t \geq 0}$ converges almost surely and in $L^1(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$. Denote the limit by $\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int_D \phi(x) S^C(ds, dx)$. Furthermore, we obtain that when $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\int_D l(x) \tilde{\phi}(x) dx < \infty$, the martingale $\int_0^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int_D \phi(x) S^J(ds, dx)$ converges almost surely and in $L^1(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$ as well. Denote the limit by $\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int_D \phi(x) S^J(ds, dx)$. Thus it follows from (1.15) that $M_t(\phi)$ converges to a non-degenerate $M_\infty(\phi)$ $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ -almost surely and in $L^1(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$ for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$.

The main goal of this paper is to establish the following almost sure convergence result.

Theorem 1.3 *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, $\lambda_1 > 0$ and that X is a $(\xi^D, \psi(\lambda) - \beta\lambda)$ -super-diffusion. Then there exists $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ of probability one (that is, $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\Omega_0) = 1$ for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$) such that, for every $\omega \in \Omega_0$ and for every nontrivial nonnegative bounded Borel function f on D with compact support whose set of discontinuous points has zero Lebesgue measure, we have*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle f, X_t \rangle(\omega)}{\mathbb{P}_\mu \langle f, X_t \rangle} = \frac{M_\infty(\phi)(\omega)}{\langle \phi, \mu \rangle}. \quad (1.18)$$

As a consequence of this theorem we immediately get the following

Corollary 1.4 *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, $\lambda_1 > 0$ and that X is a $(\xi^D, \psi(\lambda) - \beta\lambda)$ -super-diffusion. Then there exists $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ of probability one (that is, $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\Omega_0) = 1$ for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$) such that, for every $\omega \in \Omega_0$ and every relatively compact Borel subset B in D of positive Lebesgue measure whose boundary is of Lebesgue measure zero, we have*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{X_t(B)(\omega)}{\mathbb{P}_\mu[X_t(B)]} = \frac{M_\infty(\phi)(\omega)}{\langle \phi, \mu \rangle}.$$

Remark 1.5 (i) Although we assumed in this paper that the underlying motion ξ^D is a diffusion process in a bounded domain D , the arguments of this paper can be easily extended to the case when the underlying motion is a Hunt process on a locally compact separable metric space E satisfying [17, Assumption 1.1] for some measure m with full support and with $m(E) < \infty$, and the analogue of Assumption 1 above.

(ii) In [3, 6, 7, 9, 20], the branching mechanism is assumed to be binary, while in the present paper we deal with general branching mechanism. [8] considers a general branching mechanism under a $(1 + \theta)$ -moment condition, $\theta > 0$, while in the present paper, we only assume a $L \log L$ condition. In [3] the underlying motion is assumed to be a symmetric Hunt process, while in the present paper, our underlying process needs not be symmetric.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.3

A main step in proving Theorem 1.3 is the following result.

Theorem 2.1 Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, $\lambda_1 > 0$ and that X is a $(\xi^D, \psi(\lambda) - \beta\lambda)$ -super-diffusion. Then for any $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(D)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi f, X_t \rangle = M_\infty(\phi) \int_D \phi(y) \tilde{\phi}(y) f(y) dy, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.1)$$

We will prove this result first. According to Theorem 1.1 (2), when $\int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) l(x) dx = \infty$, we have

$$M_\infty(\phi) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi, X_t \rangle = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.}$$

For any $f \in \mathcal{B}_b^+(D)$,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi f, X_t \rangle \leq \|f\|_\infty \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi, X_t \rangle = 0$$

and (2.1) follows immediately from the nonnegativity of f .

It remains to prove the case when $\int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) l(x) dx < \infty$. In the remainder of this section, we assume that the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 hold and that $f \in \mathcal{B}_b^+(D)$ is fixed. Define

$$S(ds, dx) = S^J(ds, dx) + S^C(ds, dx).$$

Using (1.14), we get

$$e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi f, X_t \rangle = e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle P_t^D(\phi f), \mu \rangle + e^{-\lambda_1 t} \int_0^t \int_D (P_{t-s}^D(\phi f))(x) S(ds, dx). \quad (2.2)$$

It follows from (1.2) that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle P_t^D(\phi f), \mu \rangle = \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_D \phi(x) \tilde{\phi}(x) f(x) dx.$$

Therefore, to prove Theorem 2.1, it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \int_0^t \int_D (P_{t-s}^D(\phi f))(x) S(ds, dx) = \int_D \phi \tilde{\phi}(x) f(x) dx \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int_D \phi(x) S(ds, dx), \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.3)$$

To prove the above result, we need some lemmas first.

Lemma 2.2 For any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$, we have

$$\sum_{s>0} I_{\{\Delta X_s(\phi) > e^{\lambda_1 s}\}} < \infty, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.4)$$

Proof: First note that (1.5) implies that $\sup_{x \in D} \int_1^\infty r n^\phi(x, dr) < \infty$. It is well known that for any $g \in \mathcal{B}^+(D)$,

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \langle g, X_t \rangle = \langle P_t^D g, \mu \rangle. \quad (2.5)$$

By the definition of n^ϕ given by (1.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\sum_{s>0} I_{\{\Delta X_s(\phi) > e^{\lambda_1 s}\}} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{P}_\mu \int_0^\infty ds \int_D \int_0^\infty I_{\{r\phi(x) > e^{\lambda_1 s}\}} X_s(dx) n(x, dr) \\
&= \int_0^\infty ds \int_D \mu(dy) \int_D p^D(s, y, x) dx \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty n^\phi(x, dr).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (1.2) that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$p^D(t, y, x) \leq C e^{\lambda_1 t} \phi(y) \tilde{\phi}(x), \quad \forall t > 1, x, y \in D. \quad (2.6)$$

Therefore we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\sum_{s>0} I_{\{\Delta X_s(\phi) > e^{\lambda_1 s}\}} \right] \\
&= \int_0^1 ds \int_D \mu(dy) \int_D p^D(s, y, x) dx \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty n^\phi(x, dr) + \int_1^\infty ds \int_D \mu(dy) \int_D p^D(s, y, x) dx \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty n^\phi(x, dr) \\
&\leq e^{\|\beta\|_\infty} \mu(D) \left\| \int_1^\infty n^\phi(x, dr) \right\|_\infty + C \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \phi(y) \mu(dy) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty n^\phi(x, dr) \\
&=: C_1 + C \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda_1 s} ds \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty n^\phi(x, dr).
\end{aligned}$$

Using Fubini's theorem we get,

$$\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda_1 s} ds \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty n^\phi(x, dr) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \int_1^\infty r n^\phi(x, dr).$$

Hence we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\sum_{s>0} I_{\{\Delta X_s(\phi) > e^{\lambda_1 s}\}} \right] \leq \frac{C \langle \phi, \mu \rangle}{\lambda_1} \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_1^\infty r n^\phi(x, dr) < \infty.$$

Consequently, (2.4) holds. $\square$

Define

$$N_\phi^{(1)} := \sum_{0 < \Delta X_s(\phi) < e^{\lambda_1 s}} \delta_{(s, \Delta X_s)} \quad \text{and} \quad N_\phi^{(2)} := \sum_{\Delta X_s(\phi) \geq e^{\lambda_1 s}} \delta_{(s, \Delta X_s)},$$

and denote the compensators of $N_\phi^{(1)}$ and $N_\phi^{(2)}$ by $\hat{N}_\phi^{(1)}$ and $\hat{N}_\phi^{(2)}$ respectively. Then for any nonnegative predictable function F on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \times \mathcal{M}_F(D)$,

$$\int_0^\infty \int F(s, \nu) \hat{N}_\phi^{(1)}(ds, d\nu) = \int_0^\infty ds \int_D X_s(dx) \int_0^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} F(s, r\phi(x)^{-1} \delta_x) n^\phi(x, dr), \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty \int F(s, \nu) \widehat{N}_\phi^{(2)}(ds, d\nu) = \int_0^\infty ds \int_D X_s(dx) \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty F(s, r\phi(x)^{-1}\delta_x) n^\phi(x, dr). \quad (2.8)$$

Let $J_\phi^{(1)}$ denote the set of jump times of $N_\phi^{(1)}$, and $J_\phi^{(2)}$ the set of jump times of $N_\phi^{(2)}$. Then

$$\int_0^\infty \int F(s, \nu) N_\phi^{(1)}(ds, d\nu) = \sum_{s \in J_\phi^{(1)}} F(s, \omega, \Delta X_s), \quad (2.9)$$

$$\int_0^\infty \int F(s, \nu) N_\phi^{(2)}(ds, d\nu) = \sum_{s \in J_\phi^{(2)}} F(s, \omega, \Delta X_s), \quad (2.10)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\sum_{s \in J_\phi^{(1)}} F(s, \omega, \Delta X_s) \right] = \mathbb{P}_\mu \int_0^\infty ds \int_D X_s(dx) \int_0^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} F(s, \omega, r\phi(x)^{-1}\delta_x) n^\phi(x, dr), \quad (2.11)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\sum_{s \in J_\phi^{(2)}} F(s, \omega, \Delta X_s) \right] = \mathbb{P}_\mu \int_0^\infty ds \int_D X_s(dx) \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty F(s, \omega, r\phi(x)^{-1}\delta_x) n^\phi(x, dr). \quad (2.12)$$

We can construct two martingale measures $S^{J, (1)}(ds, dx)$ and $S^{J, (2)}(ds, dx)$ respectively from $N_\phi^{(1)}(ds, d\nu)$ and $N_\phi^{(2)}(ds, d\nu)$, similar to the way we constructed $S^J(ds, dx)$ from $N(ds, d\nu)$. Then for any bounded measurable function g on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times D$,

$$S_t^{J, (1)}(g) = \int_0^t \int_D g(s, x) S^{(1)}(ds, dx) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{M}_F(D)} F_g(s, \nu) (N_\phi^{(1)} - \widehat{N}_\phi^{(1)})(ds, d\nu), \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$S_t^{J, (2)}(g) = \int_0^t \int_D g(s, x) S^{(2)}(ds, dx) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{M}_F(D)} F_g(s, \nu) (N_\phi^{(2)} - \widehat{N}_\phi^{(2)})(ds, d\nu), \quad (2.14)$$

where $F_g(s, \nu) = \int g(s, x) \nu(dx)$.

For any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_b^+(D)$, define

$$H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) := e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_0^{(n+m)\sigma} \int_D P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) S^{J, (1)}(ds, dx)$$

and

$$L_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) := e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_0^{(n+m)\sigma} \int_D P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) S^{J, (2)}(ds, dx).$$

Lemma 2.3 If $\int_D l(x)\tilde{\phi}(x)dx < \infty$, then for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma > 0$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_b^+(D)$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu} [H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f)|\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma})]^2 < \infty \quad (2.15)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_{\mu}[H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f)|\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}] = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\mu}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.16)$$

Proof: Since $P_t^D(\phi f)$ is bounded in $[0, T] \times D$ for any $T > 0$, the process

$$H_t(f) := e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_0^t \int_D P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) S^{J,(1)}(ds, dx), \quad t \in [0, (n+m)\sigma]$$

is a martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \leq (n+m)\sigma}$. Thus

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f)|\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}) = e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_0^{n\sigma} \int_D P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) S^{J,(1)}(ds, dx),$$

and hence

$$H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f)|\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}) = e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} \int_D P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) S^{J,(1)}(ds, dx).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} M_t &:= e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_{n\sigma}^t \int_D P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) S^{J,(1)}(ds, dx) \\ &= \int_{n\sigma}^t F_{e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} P_{(n+m)\sigma-}^D(\phi f)}(s, \nu) (N_{\phi}^{(1)} - \hat{N}_{\phi}^{(1)})(ds, d\nu), \quad t \in [n\sigma, (n+m)\sigma] \end{aligned}$$

is a martingale with quadratic variation

$$\int_{n\sigma}^t F_{e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} P_{(n+m)\sigma-}^D(\phi f)}(s, \nu)^2 \hat{N}_{\phi}^{(1)}(ds, d\nu),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_{\mu} [H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f)|\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma})]^2 \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} F_{e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} P_{(n+m)\sigma-}^D(\phi f)}(s, \nu)^2 \hat{N}_{\phi}^{(1)}(ds, d\nu) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \left[\sum_{s \in \tilde{J}_{n,m}^{(1)}} F_{e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} P_{(n+m)\sigma-}^D(\phi f)}(s, \Delta X_s)^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

where $\tilde{J}_{n,m}^{(1)} = J_{\phi}^{(1)} \cap [n\sigma, (n+m)\sigma]$. Note that for any $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(D)$, $\|P_t^{\phi} f\|_{\infty} \leq \|f\|_{\infty}$ for all $t \geq 0$, which is equivalent to

$$P_t^D(\phi f)(y) \leq \|f\|_{\infty} e^{\lambda_1 t} \phi(y), \quad \forall t \geq 0, y \in D. \quad (2.18)$$

Using (2.7) and (2.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\sum_{s \in \tilde{J}_{n,m}} F_{e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} P_{(n+m)\sigma-}^D(\phi f)}(s, \Delta X_s)^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{P}_\mu \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} ds \int_D X_s(dx) \int_0^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} F_{e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} P_{(n+m)\sigma-}^D(\phi f)}^2(s, r\phi(x)^{-1}\delta_x) n^\phi(x, dr) \\
&= e^{-2\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} ds \int_D \mu(dy) \int_D p^D(s, y, x) dx \int_0^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} [P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) \phi(x)^{-1}]^2 r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \\
&\leq \|f\|_\infty^2 \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} e^{-2\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \mu(dy) \int_D p^D(s, y, x) dx \int_0^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} r^2 n^\phi(x, dr),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we used the fact that

$$F_{e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} P_{(n+m)\sigma-}^D(\phi f)}(s, r\phi(x)^{-1}\delta_x) = r e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \phi^{-1}(x) P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) \quad (2.19)$$

and in the last inequality we used (2.18). It follows from (1.2) that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$p^D(s, y, x) \leq C e^{\lambda_1 s} \phi(y) \tilde{\phi}(x), \quad \forall s > \sigma, x, y \in D. \quad (2.20)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\sum_{s \in \tilde{J}_{n,m}} F_{e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} P_{(n+m)\sigma-}^D(\phi f)}(s, \Delta X_s)^2 \right] \\
&\leq C \|f\|_\infty^2 \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_{n\sigma}^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_0^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} r^2 n^\phi(x, dr).
\end{aligned}$$

Summing over n , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{n=1}^\infty \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\sum_{s \in \tilde{J}_{n,m}} F_{e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} P_{(n+m)\sigma-}^D(\phi f)}(s, \Delta X_s)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{n=1}^\infty C \|f\|_\infty^2 \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_{n\sigma}^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_0^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \\
&\leq C \|f\|_\infty^2 \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_0^\infty dt \int_{t\sigma}^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_0^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \\
&= \frac{C}{\sigma} \|f\|_\infty^2 \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_0^\infty s e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_0^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\sigma} \|f\|_\infty^2 \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_1^\infty r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \int_{\lambda_1^{-1} \ln r}^\infty s e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \\
&+ \frac{C}{\sigma} \|f\|_\infty^2 \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_0^1 r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \int_0^\infty s e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \\
&=: I + II. \quad (2.21)
\end{aligned}$$

Using (1.5) we immediately get that $II < \infty$. On the other hand,

$$I = \frac{C}{\lambda_1^2 \sigma} \|f\|_\infty^2 \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_1^\infty r(\ln r + 1) n^\phi(x, dr).$$

Now we can use $\int_D l(x) \tilde{\phi}(x) dx < \infty$ and (1.3) to get that $I < \infty$. The proof of (2.15) is now complete. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, using (2.15) and Chebyshev's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu (|H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_\mu[H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f)|\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}]| > \varepsilon) \\ & \leq \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu [H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_\mu(H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f)|\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma})]^2 \\ & < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Then (2.16) follows easily from the Borel-Cantelli Lemma. $\square$

Lemma 2.4 *If $\int_D l(x) \tilde{\phi}(x) dx < \infty$, then for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma > 0$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_b^+(D)$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_\mu [L_{(n+m)\sigma}(f)|\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}] = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.22)$$

Proof: It is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu [L_{(n+m)\sigma}(f)|\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}] = e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_0^{n\sigma} \int_D P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) S^{J,(2)}(ds, dx).$$

Therefore,

$$L_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_\mu [L_{(n+m)\sigma}(f)|\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}] = e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} \int_D P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) S^{J,(2)}(ds, dx). \quad (2.23)$$

It follows from Lemma 2.2 that, almost surely, the support of the measure $N_\phi^{(2)}$ consists of finitely many points. Hence almost surely there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n > N_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} \int_D P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) S^{J,(2)}(ds, dx) \\ &= -e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} \int_{\mathcal{M}_F(D)} F_{P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(\cdot)}(s, \nu) \widehat{N}_\phi^{(2)}(ds, d\nu) \\ &= -e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} ds \int_D X_s(dx) \phi(x)^{-1} P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty r n^\phi(x, dr). \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

where in the last equality we used (2.8) and (2.19). Using (2.18) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} \int_D P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) S^{J,(2)}(ds, dx) \right| \\ & \leq \|f\|_\infty \int_{n\sigma}^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D X_s(dx) \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty r n^\phi(x, dr). \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

On the other hand, by (2.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[\int_{n\sigma}^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D X_s(dx) \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty r n^\phi(x, dr) \right] \\
&= \int_{n\sigma}^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \mu(dy) \int_D p^D(s, y, x) dx \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty r n^\phi(x, dr) \\
&\leq C \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_{n\sigma}^\infty ds \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty r n^\phi(x, dr) \\
&\leq C \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_{e^{\lambda_1 n\sigma}}^\infty r n^\phi(x, dr) \int_0^{\lambda_1^{-1} \ln r} ds \\
&= \frac{C}{\lambda_1} \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_{e^{\lambda_1 n\sigma}}^\infty r \ln r n^\phi(x, dr).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the dominated convergence theorem, we obtain that in $L^1(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{n\sigma}^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D X_s(dx) \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty r n^\phi(x, dr) = 0.$$

Since $\int_{n\sigma}^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D X_s(dx) \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^\infty r n^\phi(x, dr)$ is decreasing in n , the above limit holds almost surely as well. Therefore, by (2.25), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} \int_D (P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D \phi f)(x) S^{J,(2)}(ds, dx) = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.26)$$

Now (2.22) follows from (2.23) and (2.26). The proof is complete. $\square$

For any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma > 0$, set

$$C_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) := e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_0^{(n+m)\sigma} \int_D (P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D \phi f)(x) S^C(ds, dx), \quad f \in \mathcal{B}_b^+(D).$$

Then $\{C_{n\sigma}(f)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma})$ and

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(C_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) | \mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}) = e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_0^{n\sigma} \int_D (P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D \phi f)(x) S^C(ds, dx).$$

Lemma 2.5 *For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma > 0$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_b^+(D)$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_\mu[C_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) | \mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}] = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.27)$$

Proof: From the quadratic variation formula (1.13),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_\mu [H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_\mu(H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f)|\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma})]^2 \\
&= \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} \int_D (P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D \phi f)(x) S^C(ds, dx) \right]^2 \\
&= \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} e^{-2\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} ds \int_D \mu(dx) \int_D p^D(s, x, y) \left(P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D \phi f \right)^2(y) dy \\
&= \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} e^{-2\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \mu(dx) \int_D p^D(s, x, y) \phi^2(y) \left(P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^\phi \right)^2(y) dy \\
&\leq \|f\|_\infty^2 \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+m)\sigma} e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \phi(x) \mu(dx) P_s^\phi \phi(y) dy \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \|\phi\|_\infty \|f\|_\infty^2 \langle \phi, \mu \rangle e^{-\lambda_1 n\sigma}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu [C_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_\mu(C_{(n+m)\sigma}(f)|\mathcal{F}_{n\sigma})]^2 < \infty. \tag{2.29}$$

By the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we get (2.27). $\square$

Combining the three lemmas above, we have the following result.

Lemma 2.6 *If $\int_D l(x) \tilde{\phi}(x) dx < \infty$, then for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma > 0$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_b^+(D)$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{(n+m)\sigma} \rangle - \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{(n+m)\sigma} \rangle | \mathcal{F}_{n\sigma} \right] = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \tag{2.30}$$

Proof: From (1.14), we know that $e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{(n+m)\sigma} \rangle$ can be decomposed into three parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{(n+m)\sigma} \rangle \\
&= e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \langle P_{(n+m)\sigma}^D(\phi f), \mu \rangle + e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \int_0^{(n+m)\sigma} \int_D P_{(n+m)\sigma-s}^D(\phi f)(x) S(ds, dx) \\
&= e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \langle P_{(n+m)\sigma}^D(\phi f), \mu \rangle + H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) + L_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) + C_{(n+m)\sigma}(f).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{(n+m)\sigma} \rangle - \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{(n+m)\sigma} \rangle | \mathcal{F}_{n\sigma} \right] \\
&= H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_\mu [H_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) | \mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}] + L_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_\mu [L_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) | \mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}] \\
&\quad + C_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) - \mathbb{P}_\mu [C_{(n+m)\sigma}(f) | \mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}].
\end{aligned}$$

Now the conclusion of this lemma follows immediately from Lemma 2.3, Lemma 2.4, and Lemma 2.5. $\square$

Theorem 2.7 *If $\int_D l(x)\tilde{\phi}(x)dx < \infty$, then for any $\sigma > 0$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_b^+(D)$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 n \sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{n\sigma} \rangle = M_\infty(\phi) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.}$$

Proof: By (2.5) and the Markov property of super-processes we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left[e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{(n+m)\sigma} \rangle \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n\sigma} \right] = e^{-\lambda_1 n \sigma} \langle e^{-\lambda_1 m \sigma} P_{m\sigma}^D(\phi f), X_{n\sigma} \rangle. \quad (2.31)$$

It follows from (1.2) that there exist constants $c > 0$ and $\nu > 0$ such that

$$\left| \frac{e^{-\lambda_1 m \sigma} P_{m\sigma}^D(\phi f)(x)}{\phi(x)} - \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz \right| \leq c e^{-\nu m \sigma} \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\left| \frac{e^{-\lambda_1 m \sigma} P_{m\sigma}^D(\phi f)(x)}{\phi(x) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz} - 1 \right| \leq c e^{-\nu m \sigma}.$$

Thus there exist positive constants $k_m \leq 1$ and $K_m \geq 1$ such that

$$k_m \phi(x) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz \leq e^{-\lambda_1 m \sigma} P_{m\sigma}^D(\phi f)(x) \leq K_m \phi(x) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz,$$

and that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} k_m = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} K_m = 1$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\lambda_1 n \sigma} \langle e^{-\lambda_1 m \sigma} P_{m\sigma}^D(\phi f), X_{n\sigma} \rangle &\geq k_m e^{-\lambda_1 n \sigma} \langle \phi, X_{n\sigma} \rangle \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz \\ &= k_m M_{n\sigma}(\phi) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\lambda_1 n \sigma} \langle e^{-\lambda_1 m \sigma} P_{m\sigma}^D(\phi f), X_{n\sigma} \rangle &\leq K_m e^{-\lambda_1 n \sigma} \langle \phi, X_{n\sigma} \rangle \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz \\ &= K_m M_{n\sigma}(\phi) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

These two inequalities and Lemma 2.6 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 n \sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{n\sigma} \rangle &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{(n+m)\sigma} \rangle \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left[e^{-\lambda_1(n+m)\sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{(n+m)\sigma} \rangle \middle| \mathcal{F}_{n\sigma} \right] \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 n \sigma} \langle e^{-\lambda_1 m \sigma} P_{m\sigma}^D(\phi f), X_{n\sigma} \rangle \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_m M_{n\sigma}(\phi) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz \\ &= K_m M_\infty(\phi) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 n \sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{n\sigma} \rangle \geq k_m M_\infty(\phi) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.}$$

Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 n \sigma} \langle \phi f, X_{n\sigma} \rangle = M_\infty(\phi) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(z) \phi(z) f(z) dz, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.}$$

The proof is now complete. $\square$

We are now ready to give the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 Put $\Delta_\sigma(f) := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \sigma} \|P_t^\phi f - f\|_\infty$. Then for $t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]$,

$$\left| e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi P_{(n+1)\sigma-t}^\phi f, X_t \rangle - e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi f, X_t \rangle \right| \leq e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi |P_{(n+1)\sigma-t}^\phi f - f|, X_t \rangle \leq M_t(\phi) \Delta_\sigma(f). \quad (2.32)$$

By the strong continuity of the semigroup (P_t^ϕ) in $L^\infty(D)$, we have $\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \Delta_\sigma(f) = 0$. Thus,

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} \left| e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi P_{(n+1)\sigma-t}^\phi f, X_t \rangle - e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi f, X_t \rangle \right| = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.33)$$

Therefore, to prove Theorem 2.1, we only need to show that

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi P_{(n+1)\sigma-t}^\phi f, X_t \rangle = M_\infty(\phi) \int_D \phi(x) \tilde{\phi}(x) f(x) dx, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.34)$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma > 0$, $(X_t, t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma], \mathbb{P}_\mu(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{n\sigma}))$ can be regarded as a $(\xi^D, \psi(\lambda) - \beta\lambda)$ -super-diffusion with initial value $X_{n\sigma}$. Thus, for arbitrary $g \in \mathcal{B}_b^+(D)$, we have by (1.14)

$$e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi g, X_t \rangle = e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle P_{t-n\sigma}^D(\phi g), X_{n\sigma} \rangle + e^{-\lambda_1 t} \int_{n\sigma}^t \int P_{t-s}^D(\phi g)(x) S(ds, dx), \quad t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma].$$

Taking $g(x) = P_{(n+1)\sigma-t}^\phi f(x)$ in the above identity and using (1.1), we get

$$e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle \phi P_{(n+1)\sigma-t}^\phi f, X_t \rangle = e^{-\lambda_1 n \sigma} \langle \phi P_\sigma^\phi f, X_{n\sigma} \rangle + \int_{n\sigma}^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int (\phi P_{(n+1)\sigma-s}^\phi f)(x) S(ds, dx). \quad (2.35)$$

Since $\tilde{\phi}\phi$ is the invariant probability density of the semigroup (P_t^ϕ) , we have by Lemma 2.7,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 n \sigma} \langle \phi P_\sigma^\phi f, X_{n\sigma} \rangle &= M_\infty(\phi) \int_D \phi(x) \tilde{\phi}(x) P_\sigma^\phi f(x) dx \\ &= M_\infty(\phi) \int_D \phi(x) \tilde{\phi}(x) f(x) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.36)$$

Hence, by (2.35) and (2.36), to prove (2.34) it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} \int_{n\sigma}^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int (\phi P_{(n+1)\sigma-s}^\phi f)(x) S(ds, dx) = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.37)$$

Since $S(ds, dx) = S^J(ds, dx) + S^C(ds, dx) = S^{J,(1)}(ds, dx) + S^{J,(2)}(ds, dx) + S^C(ds, dx)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{n\sigma}^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int (\phi P_{(n+1)\sigma-s}^\phi f)(x) S(ds, dx) \\
&= \int_{n\sigma}^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int (\phi P_{(n+1)\sigma-s}^\phi f)(x) S^{J,(1)}(ds, dx) + \int_{n\sigma}^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int (\phi P_{(n+1)\sigma-s}^\phi f)(x) S^{J,(2)}(ds, dx) \\
&\quad + \int_{n\sigma}^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int (\phi P_{(n+1)\sigma-s}^\phi f)(x) S^C(ds, dx) \\
&=: H_{n,t}^\sigma(f) + L_{n,t}^\sigma(f) + C_{n,t}^\sigma(f).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we only need to prove that

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} H_{n,t}^\sigma(f) = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.}, \quad (2.38)$$

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} L_{n,t}^\sigma(f) = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.}, \quad (2.39)$$

and

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} C_{n,t}^\sigma(f) = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.40)$$

It follows from Chebyshev's inequality that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\sup_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} |H_{n,t}^\sigma(f)| > \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\sup_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} \int_{n\sigma}^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int (\phi P_{(n+1)\sigma-s}^\phi f)(x) S^{J,(1)}(ds, dx) \right)^2 \quad (2.41)$$

Since the process $(H_{n,t}^\sigma(f); t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma])$ is a martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]}$, applying Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality to $H_{n,t}^\sigma(f)$ and using an argument similar to the one in the proof of Lemma 2.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\sup_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} \int_{n\sigma}^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int (\phi P_{(n+1)\sigma-s}^\phi f)(x) S^{J,(1)}(ds, dx) \right)^2 \\
&\leq C_1 \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\int_{n\sigma}^{(n+1)\sigma} e^{-\lambda_1 s} \int \phi(x) P_{(n+1)\sigma-s}^\phi f(x) S^{J,(1)}(ds, dx) \right)^2 \\
&= C_1 \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+1)\sigma} e^{-2\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \mu(dy) \int_D dx p^D(s, y, x) \left(P_{(n+1)\sigma-s}^\phi f \right)^2(x) \int_0^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \\
&= C_1 \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+1)\sigma} e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \phi(y) \mu(dy) \int_D dx p^\phi(s, y, x) \phi(x)^{-1} \left(P_{(n+1)\sigma-s}^\phi f \right)^2(x) \int_0^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \\
&\leq C_2(\sigma) \|f\|_\infty^2 \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+1)\sigma} e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D dx \tilde{\phi}(x) \int_0^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \\
&\leq C_2(\sigma) \|f\|_\infty^2 \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \left[\int_{n\sigma}^{(n+1)\sigma} e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \left\| \int_0^1 r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \right\|_\infty \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+1)\sigma} e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_1^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \right] \\
&=: C_2(\sigma) \|f\|_\infty^2 \langle \phi, \mu \rangle (I_1(n) + I_2(n)), \quad (2.42)
\end{aligned}$$

where C_1 and $C_2(\sigma)$ are positive constants independent of n . (1.3) implies that $\| \int_0^1 r^2 n^\phi(\cdot, dr) \|_\infty < \infty$. Thus

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} I_1(n) < \infty. \quad (2.43)$$

Using Fubini's theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} I_2(n) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+1)\sigma} e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_1^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \\ &= \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_1^{e^{\lambda_1 s}} r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \\ &\leq \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_1^{\infty} r^2 n^\phi(x, dr) \int_{\lambda_1^{-1} \ln r}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \\ &= \lambda_1^{-1} \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \int_1^{\infty} r n^\phi(x, dr) \\ &\leq \lambda_1^{-1} \int_D \tilde{\phi}(x) dx \left\| \int_1^{\infty} r n^\phi(x, dr) \right\|_{\infty} < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (2.44)$$

Combining (2.41), (2.42), (2.43) and (2.44), we get that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \left(\sup_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} |H_{n,t}^{\sigma}(f)| > \varepsilon \right) < \infty. \quad (2.45)$$

Thus by the Borel-Cantelli lemma we have, for any $\sigma > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} H_{n,t}^{\sigma}(f) = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \text{-a.s.} \quad (2.46)$$

Therefore (2.38) is valid.

Similarly, we can prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} |C_{n,t}^{\sigma}(f)| = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \text{-a.s.}, \quad (2.47)$$

and then we get (2.40). The details are omitted here.

Using an argument similar to (2.24) we can see that almost surely there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that when $n > N_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |L_{n,t}^{\sigma}(f)| &= \int_{n\sigma}^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds \int_D P_{(n+1)\sigma-s}^{\phi} f(x) X_s(dx) \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^{\infty} r n^\phi(x, dr) \\ &\leq \|f\|_{\infty} \int_{n\sigma}^{(n+1)\sigma} e^{-\lambda_1 s} X_s(dx) \phi(x) \int_{e^{\lambda_1 s}}^{\infty} r n^\phi(x, dr) \\ &\leq \sigma \|f\|_{\infty} \left\| \int_1^{\infty} r n^\phi(x, dr) \right\|_{\infty} \sup_{s \in [n\sigma, (n+1)\sigma]} M_s(\phi). \end{aligned} \quad (2.48)$$

Therefore (2.39) holds. The proof of Theorem 2.1 is now complete.

The following result strengthens Theorem 2.1 in the sense that the exceptional does not depend on f and μ .

Theorem 2.8 Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, $\lambda_1 > 0$ and that X is a $(\xi^D, \psi(\lambda) - \beta\lambda)$ -super-diffusion. Then there exists $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ of probability one (that is, $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\Omega_0) = 1$ for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$) such that, for every $\omega \in \Omega_0$ and for every bounded Borel measurable function f on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with compact support whose set of discontinuous points has zero Lebesgue measure, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle f, X_t \rangle = M_\infty(\phi) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(y) f(y) dy. \quad (2.49)$$

Proof: Note that there exists a countable base $\mathcal{U}$ of open sets $\{U_k, k \geq 1\}$ that is closed under finite unions. Define

$$\Omega_0 := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle I_{U_k} \phi, X_t \rangle = M_\infty(\phi) \int_{U_k} \phi(y) \tilde{\phi}(y) dy \text{ for every } k \geq 1 \right\}.$$

By Theorem 2.1, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$, $P_\mu(\Omega_0) = 1$. For any open set U , there exists a sequence of increasing open sets $\{U_{n_k}; k \geq 1\}$ in $\mathcal{U}$ so that $\bigcup_k U_{n_k} = U$. Then for every $\omega \in \Omega_0$,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle I_U \phi, X_t \rangle \geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle I_{U_{n_k}} \phi, X_t \rangle \geq M_\infty(\phi) \int_{U_{n_k}} \phi(y) \tilde{\phi}(y) dy \text{ for every } k \geq 1.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ yields

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle I_U \phi, X_t \rangle \geq M_\infty(\phi) \int_U \phi(y) \tilde{\phi}(y) dy, \quad \mathbb{P}_\mu\text{-a.s. for any } \mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0. \quad (2.50)$$

We now consider (2.49) on $\{M_\infty(\phi) > 0\}$. For each $\omega \in \Omega_0 \cap \{M_\infty(\phi) > 0\}$ and $t \geq 0$, we define two probability measures ν_t and ν on D respectively by

$$\nu_t(A)(\omega) = \frac{e^{\lambda_1 t} \langle I_A \phi, X_t \rangle(\omega)}{M_\infty(\phi)(\omega)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \nu(A) = \int_A \phi(y) \tilde{\phi}(y) dy, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(D).$$

Note that the measure ν_t is well-defined for every $t \geq 0$. (2.50) tells us that ν_t converges weakly to ν as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Since ϕ is strictly positive and continuous on D , for every function f on D with compact support on E whose discontinuity set has zero Lebesgue-measure (equivalently zero ν -measure), $g := f/\phi$ is a bounded function with compact support with the same set of discontinuity. We thus have

$$\int_D g(x) \nu_t(dx) = \int_D g(x) \nu(dx),$$

which is equivalent to say

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle f, X_t \rangle = M_\infty(\phi) \int_D \tilde{\phi}(y) f(y) dy, \quad \text{for every } \omega \in \Omega_0 \cap \{M_\infty(\phi) > 0\}. \quad (2.51)$$

Since

$$e^{-\lambda_1 t} |\langle f, X_t \rangle| \leq e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle |f|, X_t \rangle = e^{-\lambda_1 t} \langle |g\phi|, X_t \rangle \leq \|g\|_\infty M_\infty(\phi).$$

(2.51) holds automatically on $\{M_\infty(\phi) = 0\}$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Lemma 2.9 For any $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(D)$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_F(D)^0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \mathbb{P}_\mu \langle f, X_t \rangle = \langle \phi, \mu \rangle \int_D f(y) \tilde{\phi}(y) dy. \quad (2.52)$$

Proof: It follows from (2.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\lambda_1 t} \mathbb{P}_\mu \langle f, X_t \rangle &= \int_D \mu(dx) e^{-\lambda_1 t} P_t^D f(x) \\ &= \int_D \mu(dx) \int_D e^{-\lambda_1 t} p^D(t, x, y) f(y) dy \\ &= \int_D \mu(dx) \phi(x) \int_D p^\phi(t, x, y) \frac{f(y)}{\phi(y)} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Using (1.2) and the dominated convergence theorem, we get (2.52).

Proof of Theorem 1.3 Theorem 1.3 is simply a combination of Theorem 2.8 and Lemma 2.9. □

References

- [1] Asmussen, S. and Hering, H. (1976): Strong limit theorems for general supercritical branching processes with applications to branching diffusions. *Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete*, **36**, 195–212.
- [2] Asmussen, S. and Hering, H. (1976): Strong limit theorems for supercritical immigration-branching processes. *Math. Scand.*, **39**, 327–342.
- [3] Chen, Z.-Q., Ren, Y.-X. and Wang, H. (2008): An almost sure scaling limit theorem for Dawson-Watanabe superprocesses. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **254**, 1988–2019.
- [4] Chen, Z.-Q. and Shiozawa, Y. (2007): Limit theorems for branching Markov processes. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **250**, 374–399.
- [5] Dawson, D. A. (1993): Measure-valued Markov processes. *Lecture Notes Math.* **1541**, 1–260, 1993, Hennequin, P.L. ed. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [6] Engländer, J. (2009): Law of large numbers for super diffusions: The non-ergodic case. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, **45**, 1–6.
- [7] Engländer, J. Harris, S. C. and Kyprianou, A. E. (2010): Strong law of large numbers for branching diffusions. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, **46**, 279–298.
- [8] Engländer, J. and Turaev, D. (2002): A scaling limit theorems for a class of superdiffusions. *Ann. Probab.*, **30**(2), 683–722.
- [9] Engländer, J. and Winter, A. (2006): Law of large numbers for a class of superdiffusions. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, **42**, 171–185.
- [10] Fitzsimmons, P. J. (1988): Construction and regularity of measure-valued Markov branching processes. *Israel J. Math.*, **64**, 337–361.
- [11] Fitzsimmons, P. J. (1992): On the martingale problem for measure-valued Markov branching processes. in: *Seminar on Stochastic Processes 1991*, Cinlar, E.; Chung, K.L.; Sharpe, M. (Eds.) 39–51.

- [12] Jacod, J. (1979): *Calcul Stochastique et Problemes de Martingales. Lecture Notes Math.*, **714**. Springer-Verlag: Berlin, Heidenberg.
- [13] Kim, P. and Song, R. (2008): Intrinsic ultracontractivity of non-symmetric diffusion semigroups in bounded domains. *Tohoku Math. J.*, **60**, 527–547.
- [14] Kim, P. and Song, R. (2008): Intrinsic ultracontractivity of non-symmetric diffusions with measure-valued drifts and potentials. *Ann. Probab.*, **36**, 1904–1945.
- [15] Le Gall, J. F. and Mytnik, L. (2005): Stochastic integral representation and regularity of the density for the exit measure of super-Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.*, **33**, 194–222.
- [16] Liu, R.-L. Ren, Y.-X. and Song, R. (2009): $L \log L$ criteria for a class of superdiffusions. *J. Appl. Probab.*, **46**, 479–496.
- [17] Liu, R.-L. Ren, Y.-X. and Song, R. (2011): $L \log L$ condition for supercritical branching Hunt processes. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, **24**, 170–193.
- [18] Perkins, E. (2002): Dawson-watanabe superprocesses and measure-valued diffusions. *Lect. Notes Math.*, **1781**, 135–192, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg.
- [19] Schaeffer, H. H. (1974): *Banach lattices and positive operators*, Springer, New York.
- [20] Wang, L. (2010): An almost sure limit theorem for super-Brownian motion. *J. Theor. Probab.*, **23**, 401–416.

Rong-Li Liu: Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing, 210093, P. R. China,
E-mail: rlliu@nju.edu.cn

Yan-Xia Ren: LMAM School of Mathematical Sciences, Center for Statistical Science, Peking University, Beijing, 100871, P. R. China, E-mail: yxren@math.pku.edu.cn

Renming Song: Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801 U.S.A.,
E-mail: rsong@math.uiuc.edu